

ADAMS
Questions & Answers
As of December 3, 2010

Q51: We are a small business concern that intends to submit a proposal in response to DARPA-BAA-11-04 for a procurement contract and we are engaged with a major university that shall act as a subcontractor to us should we be awarded a contract. We understand the requirements cited on Page 31 of the applicable BAA document that a procurement contract issued to a firm performing budget category 6.2 (Applied Research) that is not eligible to be deemed as "Contracted Fundamental Research" must flow-down to a university that is proposing to perform "Contracted Fundamental Research" the restrictive provision listed on Page 31. Please clarify if usage of the terms "Associate Contractor Agreements" and/or "associate contractors" as stated under the heading "2.6 Statement of Work (SOW):" on Page 15 of the BAA document covers and pertains to "Subcontract Agreements" and/or "Teaming Agreements" (with a potential subcontractor) also. Our experience is that an "Associate Contractor Agreement" (ACA) is a term of art in the contracting world. Use of this term does not normally apply to actual subcontracts, teaming agreements, etc.

A51: Universities performing fundamental research on-campus, whether as a prime or a subcontractor, are not restricted by DARPA's publication approval process under the ADAMS program. If a non university prime demonstrates to the PM's satisfaction that a subcontracted university is performing fundamental research on-campus, any resultant contract would distinguish the publication approval processes between the two entities.

Disregard any references to an ACA. This was accidentally included in the BAA and is not a requirement of the ADAMS program.

Q50: Is it possible to engage with DARPA in the new year once we have worked through our IP?

A50: Yes, but probably not regarding ADAMS. See Q49.

Q49: Is the due date for submissions December or April?

A49: Per the BAA, Section IV.C, the full proposal and encryption password must be submitted per the instructions in Section IV.B by the initial closing (12/9/10) in order to be considered during the initial evaluation phase. While DARPA-BAA-11-04 will remain open until the final closing date/BAA expiration (4/8/11), offerors are warned that the likelihood of funding is greatly reduced for proposals submitted after the initial closing date.

Q48: As a small company that has not worked with DARPA before, would you highly recommend partnering/teaming with a company that has?

A48: DARPA does not provide advice on such matters. Note, however, that DARPA currently has an SBIR topic under the name of ADAMS that is specifically designed for small businesses. SBIR proposals will be accepted beginning Dec. 13.

Q47: Our interest would be to develop more of a licensing agreement with DARPA, is it possible to negotiate this form of arrangement in this solicitation?

A47: Per the BAA, if offerors desire to use proprietary software or technical data or both as the basis of their proposed approach, in whole or in part, they should:

- 1) clearly identify such software/data and its proposed particular use(s);
- 2) explain how the Government will be able to reach its program goals (including transition) within the proprietary model offered; and
- 3) provide possible nonproprietary alternatives in any area that might present transition difficulties or increased risk or cost to the Government under the proposed proprietary solution. DARPA will review any proposed license agreement if it adequately addresses how the Government will reach its program goals within the proprietary model offered.

Q46. Does the project contemplate both text based and numerical databases?

A46: Potentially.

Q45: We are a large business with a GSA Schedule. We are a commercial items vendor and do not follow cost accounting standards and therefore cannot provide the detail cost breakdown as specified on page 19. Would DARPA review a proposal that was submitted on a Time and Materials basis using GSA Schedule labor rates?

A45: Each offeror may propose a contract type, but as stated in Section II of the BAA the Contracting Officer shall have sole discretion to select and negotiate the award instrument type. In this case, a firm fixed price or a other transaction agreement may be a more suitable alternative than a Time & Materials contract.

Q44: On p. 3, the specific goal of ADAMS is described as detecting anomalous behaviors in trusted insiders before or shortly after they turn. Will any thought be given to expanding ADAMS to include identifying “bad actors” *before* they are given insider status? Will ADAMS be of value to personnel reliability and suitability communities?

A44: These issues are currently out of the scope of the program.

Q43: On p. 2 of the BAA, DARPA states that ADAMS will modify graph feature definitions and their application to anomaly detection based on user feedback. Who are the users? Are they the targeted counterintelligence operators described previously as the target end-users? Will counterintelligence analysts also be considered users? Assuming that DARPA’s definition of insider threat extends to criminal actions, will

criminal investigators and analysts also provide feedback? Will behavioral scientists supporting counterintelligence and law enforcement also provide feedback?

A43: Feedback could come from all categories described in the question.

Q42: On pp. 2-3 of the BAA, DARPA defines the insider threat as “malevolent (or possibly inadvertent) actions by an already trusted person in a secure environment with access to sensitive information and information systems and sources.” DARPA goes on to say that, “Operators in the counter-intelligence (sic) community are the target end-users for ADAMS insider threat detection technology.” The problem is then illustrated by recounting the facts of the shootings at Fort Hood by Major Nidal Hasan. MAJ Hasan did not capitalize on his access to sensitive information and information systems and sources. He did not pose an intelligence threat to sensitive information and is not the subject of a Counterintelligence investigation. Does DARPA’s definition of insider threat extend to criminal actions by trusted insiders who threaten lives and property?

A42: Yes.

Q41: On p. 2 of the BAA, DARPA states that research that results primarily in evolutionary improvements to the existing state of practice is specifically excluded. Can you give us examples of existing practices? Do these practices include anomaly detection tools being employed in DoD service and agency information technology systems?

A41: Proposers are expected to be familiar with existing practices.

Q40: Is this BAA directed by or being announced in cooperation with any or all members of the DoD Insider Threat Defense Senior Steering Committee? If so, which ones?

A40: No.

Q39: The BAA stated that "In recognition of the sensitivity of data collected from or relating to live systems, TA 1 performers are encouraged to have at least one team member with (or eligibility for) a SECRET level clearance in order to allow them to run tests at some TA 2 performer's site." Would a team consisting of a prime who does not have security clearance and a sub who does be considered eligible for TA1 of the DARPA ADAMS program?

A39: Yes. Since there is a possibility that US citizenship will be required for access to government supplied data, there should be somebody on the team that is a US citizen who can run the algorithms developed on the supplied data.

Q38: Can you clarify where in Sections 2 or 3 where the IP rights statements should be placed?

A38: Section 3, after 3.7 is fine.

Q37: Can you please advise if a PI or Co-PI on this proposal must be a US citizen? Does having a Green Card suffice?

A37: A PI or Co-PI need not be a US citizen. But see Q39.

Q36: Would DARPA consider using a proven commercial technology as a platform for the ADAMS project rather than develop this piece of the project from scratch?

A36: Only if the government has full use rights at no cost to the commercial technology used.

Q35: "ADAMS will develop a set of requirements and design modifications for existing sensor suites to provide additional needed data." Are you looking to work with specific "existing sensor suites" (i.e. Mandiant, Splunk, etc.)? When will the requirements and design modifications for these existing suites be available? In addition to restrictions on data access, would it be acceptable to sanitize the collected data before providing it to TA1 participants?

A35: We are not looking to work with any specific existing sensor suites. The sensor suites referred to are those that will be proposed by the TA2 providers. Based on data needs agreed on by the ADAMS community, TA2 providers may have to make modifications to the sensors they are using. In this case, it is up to the TA2 providers to specify and implement the required modifications. Data sanitization is acceptable if it can be demonstrated that the sanitized data would preserve its utility for the TA1 developers.

Q34: This is a question regarding Section 7 in the BAA, titled "Electronic and Information Technology". This section states that "All electronic and information technology acquired through this solicitation must satisfy the accessibility requirements of Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act (29 U.S.C. 794d) and FAR Subpart 39.2." Does this impose a requirement that any software created and delivered under ADAMS must be developed with user interfaces specifically tailored for access by individuals with disabilities? (note that this will significantly escalate the cost of development).

A34: If the development effort fits within the definition under Section 508 then technically, yes, it should be disability accessible. The software must be designed so that if it works and transitions, it could easily be programmed so a Federal Worker with a disability could use it. It is not necessary to build it now with user interfaces for disabled users until the system is proven to work, but it must be made adaptable if the circumstance arises.

Q33: TA1 performers will be using data based on observations of people doing their jobs. Research concerning such data is often constrained by 45 CFR Part 46, requiring Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval. The BAA (Section IV.B.3.3, p. 20, and V.B.3, p. 29) requires that if "human use is a factor," proposal must specify their IRB plan. At the industry day, the question was raised whether research in ADAMS would be subject

to 45 CFR Part 46 and require IRB, and an answer was promised, but the subject is not discussed in the recently released FAQ. Can you please provide guidance on this subject so that we can know whether to include IRB procedures in our budgets and proposals?

A33: An IRB plan is not required for the proposal, but offerors should be aware that an IRB plan might be required once selections have been made and be prepared for that possibility.

▲ ▲ ▲ Latest Q/A ▲ ▲ ▲

Q32: Will you accept a partial solution within ADAMS Tech Area 1? In other words, does any Tech Area 1 bid need to be comprehensive, or would you be open to funding interesting solutions that only satisfy part of the technical scope?

A32: Yes, partial solutions may be proposed under Tech Area 1.

Q31: Will proposals submitted under DFARS 225.870 be allowed?

A31: Per the BAA, foreign participants and/or individuals may participate to the extent that such participants comply with any necessary Non-Disclosure Agreements, Security Regulations, Export Control Laws, and other governing statutes applicable under the circumstances.

Q30: In reviewing the solicitation, we noticed that the page limitation—35 pages covering the Technical Section, Management Section, SOW, Schedule, Personnel, Costing, etc.—is considerably shorter than the limitations given in other recent DARPA solicitations (e.g., RC2, GUARD DOG, WAND). We wanted to confirm that the page limits provided in the RFP were accurate. If so, do you have any further guidance about the relative allocation of pages, given the content requested in the RFP?

A30: Note, this is a BAA, not an RFP. Yes, the page count listed in the BAA is accurate. Each offeror should allocate the number of pages to each section as applicable for their research while remaining within the overall limit of 35 pages.

Q29: Does the data you have now allow attribution of an activity to a particular individual?

A29: DARPA doesn't have data now. The data will be provided by the Technical Area 2 performer(s).

Q28: Is there an SBIR associated with this?

A28: No, there is no SBIR associated with it.

Q27: Will an FFRDC (like Sandia), be able to bid as a team member or sub to a university bidder?

A27: If an FFRDC can meet the eligibility requirements that are outlined in the BAA (Section III.A.2), they may submit a proposal as a prime or sub.

Q26: Is there a preference for Firm Fixed Price, Cost Plus, Time and Materials?

A26: Proposals identified for negotiation may result in a procurement contract, cooperative agreement or other transaction agreement due to the nature of the work proposed, the required degree of interaction between parties, and other factors. Each offeror may propose a contract type, but as stated in Section 2 of the BAA the Contracting Officer shall have sole discretion to select and negotiate the award instrument type.

Q25: How many DARPA partner locations do proposing vendors need to consider when building our pricing proposals?

A25: At this time, that would be difficult to estimate. A reasonable estimate should be sufficient.

Q24: May universities bid as a lone team, or will teaming with companies be preferred?

A24: There is no preference.

Q23: Is there any consideration for set-asides such as SDVO, etc?

A23: No, there are no set-aside programs. See Section III.A.1 of the BAA for further information.

Q22: How important to you is the detection of situations when multiple people are involved in a malicious behavior, while none of them individually looks suspicious? How often do you think such multi-person behaviors happen (and are important to customers/transition partners) versus single-person malicious behaviors? Would there be data about person-to-person interactions?

A22: This is important. We don't know how often it happens. There will likely be person to person data available, but your proposed solution should be able to find any kind of malicious behavior.

Q21: Can Technical Area 2 proposals be either data collection or test evaluation or transition or must it be all of those?

A21: Technical Area 2 involves all of the above so proposals must address all three areas.

Q20. What does I2O stand for in DARPA?

A20: I2O stands for the Information Innovation Office in DARPA.

Q19: Approximately how many awards do you expect to fund and how much money per award? Any indication of split in money between Task 1 and Task 2?

A19: In terms of awards, it depends on what solutions are proposed. There is \$35M to divide in any way that makes sense. There are no pre-conceived ideas. Per the BAA, awards are contingent on the quality of the proposals received and the availability of funds.

Q18: Given the requirements to deliver a complete operable, maintainable, modifiable system, how should we think about the way we work with data providers. Will someone create a standard open data format?

A18: Whatever is developed, will be tested continually in the operator's environment. Operators will be involved in this from the beginning, so by the end of two years, whatever is running will be running in their environment. To answer the second question, very early on in the program the algorithm developers and data providers will get together and work this out.

Q17: What role do you expect natural language technologies, which can extract semantics from text, should play in this program?

A17: Natural language technologies on any scale are out of scope for the ADAMS program. The question is, can you find natural language processing technology that would be useful and how would you apply it.

Q16: Are you interested in large data sets of more general security data on which analysis performers can test their anomaly detection schemes? For example, is there any value in providing large data sets of firewall/ IDS events, or must the data be directly tied to specific users enabling insider threat in particular?

A16: DARPA is willing to consider any type of data that would be useful to solving the problem.

Q15: If the data being tested against is classified, will the results of testing any performer's unclassified analysis methods be classified also?

A15: The goal is to have no classified data.

Q14: In your example of Ft. Hood with 65k soldiers and 20 messages each per day, your estimate was 2M nodes. Does this mean that each message is a separate node?

A14: No, the people were the nodes. The messages were represented by links.

Q13: May performers instrument the facility of the data providers?

A13: That remains to be seen.

Q12: A lot of discussion was spent on graph analysis, but there are other technologies which can be effectively applied to this problem. What would be the implication and impact on the proposed evaluation if no graph analysis is proposed?

A12: If you have a better idea, we are willing to consider it.

Q11: Will there be a white paper stage?

A11: No, this BAA is only soliciting proposals.

Q10: Are you planning to have video and audio data?

A10: There will be no audio and video data at this stage. It will most likely be at the next stage. If you have an idea, however, we are willing to consider it.

Q9: For the data to be provided, have subscribing/anonymization issues been resolved to ensure data is unclassified?

A9: Nothing has been resolved yet. That will be up to the data providers to solve.

Q8: Do you plan to address validation during this phase?

A8: DARPA plans to define some metrics for performance of the algorithms that will be evaluated. These evaluations are not for the purpose of down-selecting and competing. The evaluations are for research and educational purposes only.

Q7: Have you considered how to generate ground truth for selected data sets to enable testing of algorithms?

A7: Yes, with some type of red teaming. The data will ultimately be live data that's collected. So in terms of actually detecting insider threat activity, there would be red teams, meaning people who actually go into environments where the data collectors are and who would perform malicious behavior (this is planned). This is to see if you will be able to detect these threats.

Q6: There is likely to be a time lag before collected data is available. Are there plans to provide algorithms developers with interim data?

A6: Yes, some type of data, or at least an identification of such data, should be available for people to use at their own facility, as opposed to data that might have to be used at the provider's facility. You might have data of your own that you could use but, per the BAA, if you have anything like that, you will need to include a description in your proposals.

Q5: Will proposers be expected to outline subsequent phases beyond Phase 1 (in their proposals)?

A5: No, this solicitation only addresses Phase 1.

Q4: Would you make your presentation available?

A4: The presentations are posted on the BAA website.

Q3: Is there any formal relationship or collaboration with the DARPA CINDER Program?

A3: No, there is no formal relationship or collaboration with the DARPA CINDER Program.

Q2: Are you going to collect context information on potential insiders? (i.e., financial, police, etc.)?

A2: Possibly, but that remains to be seen.

Q1: The title contains the words "Multiple Scales", please elaborate.

A1: Multiple scales refer to multiple time scales, meaning events that could happen over a day, over a week, or over a month. Multiple scales also refers to scales of activity which are events involving one person, a small group of people, or a whole department.